

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 have been previously canceled. Claims 15, 25 and 34 are currently amended and no claims have been canceled or added by way of this amendment. Therefore, claims 15-34 are currently pending and presented for examination. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Support for Claim Amendments:

Applicants have amended claims 15, 25 and 34 to further refine the scope of Applicants' invention. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification at paragraphs [00018], [00020] and [00040] and figure 2.

Response to Rejections Under Section 103:

Claims 15-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a), the Examiner contending that these claims are obvious over Albrecht in view of German Patent Publication DE 579989 (DE '989).

In the instant Office Action, the Examiner has relied upon DE '989 to modify Albrecht to obviate Applicants claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit the DE '989 is a German language document. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide an English language translation of DE '989 in accordance with the requirements of MPEP 706.02.

Applicants' amended claims 15, 25 and 34 each recite:

... wherein the first abutment and the second abutment are each configured as a **radial groove protruding in an axial direction** of the rotor sufficient to **resist an operative radial force** of the respective first sheet metal component and the second sheet metal component.

In the instant Office Action, the Examiner concedes that "Albrecht does not teach the first abutment and a second abutment arranged on an adjacent turbine blade." The Examiner then relies upon DE '989 to teach first and second abutments. However, as seen in the sole figure, the thin structures b' of DE '989 contact the hammer shaped blade root section within the rotor body and then bend axially to a downstream blade root section without contacting any abutment of either the upstream or downstream blade. Therefore, DE '989 lacks "...first and ... second abutment[s] ... each configured as a **radial groove protruding in an axial direction** of

the rotor sufficient to resist an operative radial force of the respective first ... and ... second sheet metal component[s],” as recited in claims 15, 25 and 34.

Furthermore, a proper combination of Albrecht in view of ‘989 would yield turbine blade rows having a blade portion that extends beyond the blade platform/body in a circumferential direction to intersect an adjacent blade within the same row of blades to form a seal in accordance with Albrecht, and then have a thin structure b’ running from the root portion of an upstream blade row to a downstream blade row root portion without contacting an abutment of either the upstream or downstream blade, contrary to the recitation of claims 15, 25 and 34.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Albrecht in view of ‘989 fails to teach or suggest Applicants claimed invention. Applicants further submit that claims 15-34 are patentable and request the Examiner withdraw the section 103 rejections.

(please proceed to the next page)

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 21, 2009

By: Janet D. Hood
Janet D. Hood
Registration No. 61,142
(407) 736-4234

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830